

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

AARON FARMER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:15-CV-427-PLR-CCS
)	
SETERUS, INC., and FEDERAL NATIONAL,)	
MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This case is before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Rules of this Court, and Standing Order 13-02.

The parties appeared before the Court telephonically to address a discovery dispute and the Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Amend Scheduling Order [Doc. 18], filed on January 11, 2017. As to the discovery dispute, Defendant Seterus asserts that on November 8, 2016, it served upon the Plaintiff its First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents. To date, the Plaintiff has not responded to the written discovery request, which was due on December 12, 2016, or indicate when responses would be forthcoming despite Seterus' efforts to contact Plaintiff's counsel on three separate occasions to inquire when responses could be expected. Plaintiff's counsel states that due to his schedule in conjunction with previously scheduled matters, he has been unable to meet with the Plaintiff to provide responses to the discovery request. During the telephone conference, Plaintiff's counsel represented to the Court that he would be able to respond to the discovery request within the next 14 days. Counsel for Seterus stated that it had no objection to a 14-day extension of time.

Based upon the Plaintiff's representation during the telephone conference and the lack of opposition from Defendant Seterus, the Court **GRANTS** the Plaintiff an extension of time, up to and including **February 3, 2017**, in which to provide full and complete responses to Defendant Seterus' First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents.

As to the Unopposed Motion to Amend Scheduling Order [Doc. 18], the motion requests that the January 14, 2017 deadline for filing dispositive motions be extended to February 14, 2017. The motion explains that because Seterus has been unsuccessful in its attempts to obtain discovery responses from the Plaintiff, it would not be able to meet the dispositive motion deadline set forth in the Scheduling Order [Doc. 13]. The motion also states that the Plaintiff does not oppose extending the dispositive motion deadline to February 14, 2017. During the telephone conference, the parties stated that they would be mediating this case on February 13 or 15, 2017.

For good cause shown, the Court finds the Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Amend Scheduling Order [**Doc. 18**] is well taken, and the same is **GRANTED**. Because the parties are planning to mediate the case of February 13 or 15, the Court **RESETS** the dispositive motion deadline to **February 24, 2017**. All other deadlines as set forth in the Scheduling Order [Doc. 13] shall remain unchanged.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/ C. Clifford Shirley, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge